UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/511,777	02/24/2000	Okoziem Allen	2204/A14	5651

2101   7590   03/05/2003

BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP
125 SUMMER STREET
BOSTON, MA 02110-1618

EXAMINER
ENGLAND, DAVID E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2143	

DATE MAILED: 03/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		09/511,777	ALLEN ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		David E. England	2143	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _09 January 2003_ .

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-16_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _5_ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 – 16 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1, 3, 5 – 8, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The term "first portion of the address" is not stated anywhere in the specification. Furthermore, claims 1, 8, 15 and 16 use the term "second portion of the address", which is also not stated anywhere in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chintakrindi et al.
U.S. Patent No. 6216159 (hereinafter Chintakrindi).

2.   Referencing claim 1, Chintakrindi teaches a method for representing addressing

information in a communication system, the method comprising apportioning at least one

address into a first portion and a second portion, and encoding the first portion of the at least one

address using a regular expression representing an attribute of the first portion of the address and

using the regular expression in place of the first portion at least one address, (e.g. cols. 6 – 8).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth
> in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the
> prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention
> was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability
> shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Chintakrindi (6216159) in view of Ankney et al. (5113499) (hereinafter Ankney).

5.   As per claim 2, Chintakrindi does not specifically teach at least one address comprises at

least one X.121 address. Ankney teaches at least one address comprises at least one X.121

address, (e.g. col. 9, lines 6 – 30). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time

of the invention to combine Ankney with Chintakrindi because if a user needed to utilize a

system that used X.121, it would be more efficient to have a diverse system with multiple

addressing schemes.

6.   As per claim 3, Chintakrindi does not specifically teach using the regular expression in

place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a source address field

of an address configuration table. Ankney teaches using the regular expression in place of the at

least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a source address field of an address

configuration table, (e.g. col. 9, lines 6 – 30). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art

at the time of the invention to combine Ankney with Chintakrindi because it is more convenient

for a user to use a name for an address rather then a stream of numbers.

7.   Claims 4, 5, 7 – 12, 13 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Chintakrindi (6216159) in view of Beser (6189102) in further view of Belser et al.

(6151324) (hereinafter Belser).

8.   As per claim 4, Chintakrindi does not specifically teach wherein the at least one address

comprises at least one MAC address. Beser teach wherein the at least one address comprises at

least one MAC address, (e.g. col. 35, lines 6 – 32). It would have been obvious to one skilled in

the art at the time of the invention to combine Beser with Chintakrindi because it would be more

versatile if the system utilized the functionality of a MAC address so a device has a physical

address along with a logical address.

9.   As per claim 5, Chintakrindi and Beser do not specifically teach wherein using the

regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in

a source address field of an address configuration table. Belser teaches wherein using the regular

expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a

source address field of an address configuration table, (e.g. col. 4, line 55 – col. 5, line 8). It

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Belser

with the combine system of Chintakrindi and Beser because it is more convenient for a user to

use a name for an address rather then a stream of numbers.

10.   As per claim 7, Chintakrindi and Beser do not specifically teach wherein using the

regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in

a management information base. Belser teaches wherein using the regular expression in place of

the at least one address comprises storing the regular expression in a management information

base, (e.g. col. 10, lines 20 – 45). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time

of the invention to combine Belser with the combine system of Chintakrindi and Beser because it

allows a network manager monitor packets to ensure that transmission is successful and that

devices are available in the network.

11.   As per claim 10, Chintakrindi teaches wherein the regular expression defines a source

address group, (e.g. cols. 6 – 8).

12.   As per claim 13, Chintakrindi teaches wherein the storage comprises a routing table, (e.g.

cols. 6 – 8).

13.   As per claim 14, Chintakrindi does not specifically teach wherein the regular expression defines a forwarding equivalence class for a routing table entry. Beser teaches wherein the regular expression defines a forwarding equivalence class for a routing table entry, (e.g. col. 20, lines 23 – 48 & col. 22, line 60 – col. 23, line 9). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Beser with Chintakrindi because it would be more efficient if the system were able to forward equivalence class for a routing table entry in case of a network that would be expanded and needed to update a routing table.

14.   Claims 8, 9, 11, 15, 16 are rejected for similar reasons as stated above.

15.   Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chintakrindi (6216159) in view of Peacock (6381650).

16.   As per claim 6, Chintakrindi does not specifically teach wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises using the regular expression to specify at least one address of an address pool. Peacock teaches wherein using the regular expression in place of the at least one address comprises using the regular expression to specify at least one address of an address pool, (e.g. col. 3, lines 19 – 40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine Peacock with Chintakrindi because it is more efficient to have a regular expression to signify a pool of addresses then having multiple regular expressions for a pool of addresses. This could save space in address tables and time in packet switching.

17.   Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chintakrindi

(6216159) in view of Belser (6151324) in further view of Peacock (6381650).

18.   As per claim 12, Chintakrindi and Belser do not specifically teach wherein the regular

expression defines an address pool. Peacock teaches wherein the regular expression defines an

address pool, (e.g. col. 3, lines 19 – 40). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at

the time of the invention to combine Peacock with the combine system of Chintakrindi and

Belser because it is more efficient to have a regular expression to signify a pool of addresses then

having multiple regular expressions for a pool of addresses. This could save space in address

tables and time in packet switching.

19.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 – 16 have been considered but are moot in

view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

20.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

21.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

22.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

23.   a.   Cianfrocca et al. U.S. Patent No. 6088796 discloses Secure middleware and

server control system for querying through a network firewall.

24.   b.   McAuley et al. U.S. Patent No. 5386413 discloses Fast multilevel hierarchical

routing table lookup using content addressable memory.

25.   c.   Franke et al. U.S. Patent No. 6507869 discloses Method and apparatus for asset

tracking of network attached devices.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to David E. England whose telephone number is 703-305-5333.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur, 7:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David A. Wiley can be reached on 703-308-5221. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are none for regular

communications and none for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is none.

David E. England
Examiner
Art Unit 2143

De
February 21, 2003

DAVID WILEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100